

UNITED STÂTES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE Patent and Trademark Office

Address: COMMISSIONER OF PATENTS AND TRADEMARKS Washington, D.C. 20231

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR		ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.
8/990,195 12	:/12/97 F	AN	.J	
г		П		EXAMINER
,		QM21/0318		,
MIN S.XU MERCHANT,GOULD,SMITH,EDELL,WELTER & SCHMIDT,F.A 3100 NORWEST CENTER 90 SOUTH SEVENTH STREET			3727 DATE MAILE	. 15
MINNEAPOLIS MN 55402-4131			03/18/99	

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

Commissioner of Patents and Trademark:

	Application No.				
	Application No. Applicant(s) Applicant(s)				
Office Action Summary	Everyiner Group Art Unit				
	7-My 372				
-The MAILING DATE of this communication appears	on the cover sheet beneath the correspondence address				
Period for Response	7				
A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR RESPONSE IS SE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.	T TO EXPIRE MONTH(S) FROM THE				
from the mailing date of this communication. - If the period for response specified above is less than thirty (30) days, a - If NO period for response is specified above, such period shall, by defau	36(a). In no event, however, may a response be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS response within the statutory minimum of thirty (30) days will be considered timely. It, expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication . statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133).				
Status					
Responsive to communication(s) filed on	•				
☐ This action is FINAL .					
 Since this application is in condition for allowance except for accordance with the practice under Ex parte Quayle, 1935 					
Disposition of Claims					
Claim(s) 8-13	is/are pending in the application.				
	is/are withdrawn from consideration.				
☐ Claim(s)	is/are allowed.				
(S) 8 -73	is/are rejected.				
☐ Claim(s)					
☐ Claim(s)	are subject to restriction or election				
Application Papers requirement.					
☐ See the attached Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing	Review, PTO-948.				
☐ The proposed drawing correction, filed on is ☐ approved ☐ disapproved.					
☐ The drawing(s) filed on is/are objected to by the Examiner.					
☐ The specification is objected to by the Examiner.					
$\hfill\Box$ The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner.					
Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119 (a)-(d)					
 □ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority und □ All □ Some* □ None of the CERTIFIED copies of th □ received. □ received in Application No. (Series Code/Serial Number) 	e priority documents have been				
 received in this national stage application from the Interr 	national Bureau (PCT Rule 1 7.2(a)).				
*Certified copies not received:					
Attachment(s)					
Information Disclosure Statement(s), PTO-1449, Paper No.					
☑Notice of References Cited, PTO-892	☐ Notice of Informal Patent Application, PTO-152				
□ Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review, PTO-948 □ Other					
Office Action Summary					

لزم

Serial Number: 08/990195

Art Unit: 3727

In view of the newly cited references and the IDS submitted by applicant, the finality of

the office action dated 12/30/98 has been withdrawn

The following is a quotation of the appropriate paragraphs of 35 U.S.C. 102 that form the basis

for the rejections under this section made in this Office action:

A person shall be entitled to a patent unless --

(a) the invention was known or used by others in this country, or patented or described in a printed publication in

this or a foreign country, before the invention thereof by the applicant for a patent.

(b) the invention was patented or described in a printed publication in this or a foreign country or in public use or

on sale in this country, more than one year prior to the date of application for patent in the United States.

Claims 8-13 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 102(b) as being clearly anticipated by

Shackelford. Shackelford shows all the structure of the device as recited by the claims.

The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness

rejections set forth in this Office action:

(a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in

section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are

such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person

having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negatived by the

manner in which the invention was made.

Claims 8-13 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Moskowitz in

Shackelford shows all the structure of the device as recited by the claims view of Shackelford.

except the soil in the legs. However, Shackelford shows soil in the legs of the pot. It would have been obvious to provide legs of the container of Moskowitz with soil in order to use the container for the plants that need soil.

Any inquiry concerning this office action will be directed to Examiner Joseph Moy, (703) 308-1145.

Fax No: (703)305-3579

Date: 03/12/99

Joseph M. Moy Primary Examiner